

## COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, November 12, 1982

Present: M. Singer, Chairman, R. Breen, D. Taddeo, J. Chaikelson, R. Roy, J. Princz, C. Foster, T. Arbuckle-Maag, A. Broes, C. Bertrand, K. Bindon, R. Diubaldo, A. Galler, C. Kalman, B. Lewis, M. Oppenheim, S. McEvenue, D. McDougall, G. Newsham, R. Pallen, B. Petrie, H. Proppe, J. Ryan, L. Sanders, H. Shulman, M. Squires, G. Trudel, A. Ketter, S. Ferguson, A. Okwudi, A. Megann, J. Griffin, M. Mingarelli, J. Doyle.

Absent with Regrets: D. Dicks, A. Ross, B. Sahni.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:40 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Prof. Pallen asked to have added to the agenda the question of practical laboratory examinations in the final week of classes for Division III.

The Chairman suggested that if all the business on hand is completed Council might wish to bring back item 8c which was dealt with at the last meeting. He asked that it be added to the end of the agenda.

82-12-1 (Taddeo/McEvenue) to approve the agenda as amended. Vote: Carried

3. Chairman's Remarks

The Chairman reported that the members of Council who attended the meetings of the Steering Committee of the University Mission Study had brought attention to the problems which Council thought were pressing. As a result the Rector has issued a statement which will appear in the next issue of the Thursday Report. He read the statement (ASFC82-12-D1).

In response to the question of the two-campus operation and the request that more information be made available, it was reported that Vice-Rector Breen would make some clarifying statements which would be helpful when that point on the agenda is reached.

Comments were made on the composition of the Steering Committee of the University Mission Study. There was some feeling that it was not a representative body.

4. Elections

82-12-2 (Roy/Pallen) to accept Steering Committee's recommendation that Prof. A. Broes replace Prof. Dewey on Senate during the current year. Prof. Broes was elected by acclamation.

5. Practical Laboratory Examinations in the Last Week of Term

2-12-3

(Roy/Pallen) to approve the list of courses for which practical laboratory examinations in the last week of term are to be held (Division III). Vote: Carried

It was noted that Chemistry no longer schedules such examinations. Professor Taggart asked if it was not possible, since the French Department had discontinued this practice, for other departments to do the same. It was reported that these tests are an essential part of the evaluation process.

6. Looking to the Future - "Report of the Committee on Priorities and Planning" and "Phase I Report of the University Mission Study" - third session (ASFC 82-11-D1)

Discussion on Priorities

The Chairman asked if there were any items not labelled "A" priority on the restructuring aspect in the document that members would like to have placed under item 3 (c). Items 59 and 60 were added to the "A" priority list.

The members of Council agreed to allow some discussion on each item without a motion on the floor as the procedure to be followed.

c) Restructuring of the University

Recommendation 61 - "The present arrangement of Divisional Deans in Arts and Science: Deans for Divisions I, II, III and a Provost would be reorganized so that Arts and Science would be the responsibility of a single Dean."

Positions in favour of the resolution were expressed by some members of Council:

Professor McEvenue based his approval on the premise that if there is to be only one Vice-Rector having a single Dean of Arts and Science would be the only way to assure the unity of Arts and Science. It would also result in more authority being placed in the hands of department chairmen.

It was pointed out that the size of the Faculty should not be considered a factor in the decision because there are other larger Faculties that operate under a single Dean. Toronto and Harvard were mentioned.

Professor Broes noted that chairmen would have a more important role. He would have the advantage of appealing along with all other chairmen to a single Dean; the interest of a department would not be lost, rather it could be argued for more forcibly.

Professor Ryan offered the suggestion that those who are not concerned with the whole picture but rather with their individual interests, who care only for themselves and not about the good of the whole, would prefer the status quo. Arguments of unwieldiness and lack of communication are bogus arguments that can be handled

by a sophisticated consideration of the Deans infra-structure. .

Professor Kalman thought that a single Dean would be able to devote more time to the Faculty and would not be required to divide his time to the extent required by the Vice-Rector.

He asked the question "is it desirable to continue with a single Faculty or is it desirable to fission into separate faculties", and concluded his remarks by saying that he was in favour of one Dean.

Some questions were raised by Council members opposed to the recommendation:

Professor Oppenheim wondered, if there is to be a single Dean would it be possible for that person to be sensitive to the needs, to the different foci, to special requirements of different departments, or would the Dean be so overcome by administrating to so many departments that he will choose the lowest common denominator, something like student enrolment, to decide how to allocate resources. He thought that a single dean would be so overtaxed with work that it would be possible for him to overlook special requirements of a particular department.

Professor Newsham spoke in favour of a multiplicity of Deans saying that under the present situation Deans still teach and do research, therefore know some of the concerns of the departments and are understanding. She thought that a single Dean would be so far removed from departments that there would be little chance for departments to have positions known on any debate.

Professor Petrie agreed that a single Dean would be too distant and would require a person with skills that would be difficult to find. Few people have the renaissance capabilities to simultaneously understand all the components of the humanities, the arts, the social sciences, and the natural and biological sciences to the satisfaction of the people in the departments concerned.

A number of Council members spoke in favour of postponing the decision on the recommendation:

Professor Maag agreed with Professor Kalman's position that the fundamental problem is what is going to happen to Arts and Science and that the problem of the management of Arts and Science is one that should not be decided to-day. She didn't think that faculty was ready to make the decision. She continued by saying that the fundamental problem facing Arts and Science is survival over the next ten years and that an administrative structure is needed to maximize the chances of survival. She thought that the chances of survival are going to depend on how rapidly we can respond to external pressures, how rapidly we can change programmes develop new ones, to make new arrangements to meet new needs, therefore an administrative structure is needed where the communication time is very fast from the departments to the Dean, to the Vice-Rector..

She noted that the point of action in a university is the intersection between the professor, the student and the discipline and that what is needed is a model that will get the information from that point of action upwards. She urged that the recommendation be opposed at this time saying that it is in the domain of Arts and Science to make this decision; that in the interim we are willing to continue with the status quo. She concluded by saying that her department was against a single Dean, and that there is no consensus at this time across the Faculty.

Professor Pallen supported Professor Maag's position.

Professor Proppe agreed that it would be premature to come to a decision so early. He was concerned by the fact that approximately 300 faculty members would be represented by one Dean in Arts and Science whereas the Fine Arts Dean would represent only 70 people. He worried about the alienation between the individual faculty member and that Dean. From the partisan and perhaps selfish point of view of Division III, he was concerned that where now decisions are made under five or six chairmen, under the new structure, decisions would be made with 30 or 40 chairmen, each wanting a piece of the action. He thought the question should be looked at from two points of view; from the academic point of view he sympathized with Professor McEvenue, Dr. Breen and others, but from the point of view of decision making, he thought it would be a mistake to have a single man at the top.

Vice-Rector Breen said he wanted to bring a few facts to the attention of Council which should be kept in mind as the issue was debated. The fact of a decline in student enrolment in Arts and Science from 1975-1979 of 18% and which although arrested this year, will continue; that a structure must be developed to cope with this particular area of the University where the enrolments are going to decline. If Council were to opt for something other than a single Dean it would be a decision for the multiplication of Faculties, electing a particular structure for the University would be to choose a particular philosophy of education. We must continue to create a complementarity of the general education and the specialized education, started first with the colleges and as a second step with the development of a flexible core curriculum. The other question to be addressed is that of how best to allocate resources in those areas which are declining and to what extent could a single Dean come to grips with the problem.

Professor Shulman indicated that he didn't know the best way to retain the fact of the Arts and Science Faculty. He was concerned about voting for a structure where the authority and power of such a Dean is not known.

He asked the Deans and Provost to express their viewpoints.

Dean Taddeo indicated that he was in favour of one Faculty of Arts and Science headed by a single Academic Dean.

2-12-4

(McEvenue/Bindon) to adopt recommendation 61.

Dean Chaikelson said she was not sure what is the best structure for Arts and Science. She suggested that the problem in the Faculty was that of how to convince others we are as good as we are; that the problem is that everything that happens is enrolment-driven.

2-12-5

(Proppe/Maag) to table the motion on recommendation 61. Vote: Defeated (10/18)

Referring to the power structure, Professor Doyle asked if a Divisional Dean in the Faculty of Arts and Science was on the same level as a Dean of another Faculty. Vice-Rector replied in the affirmative.

Provost Singer said his personal opinion was that the decision making structure on the academic side has been subverted by the existence of two Vice-Rectors Academic so that, in fact, the Rector of the University has to become the final arbiter in academic matters. In creating the new structure with one Vice-Rector Academic, we are making it possible for that individual to focus more clearly on issues other than the academic priorities of the University.

Vice-Rector Breen replied that he thought it wise at the time of the merger to have two Academic Vice-Rectors, three Deans and a Provost, but that it was never intended that that structure would be a permanent arrangement.

The debate continued.

Dean Roy said he has some reservations and some concerns about a single Dean representing such a large and diverse constituency. It would be difficult to represent a broad range of interests and opinions in university bodies. A single Dean with a large number of Associate Deans would make it difficult for chairmen to be aware of the lines of responsibility. He added that if there is to be a single Dean the divisions should be abolished.

Provost Singer was given the consent of Council to present his position.

He opened his remarks by saying that it is to the credit of Vice-Rector Breen that the Arts and Science Faculty exists. He made it quite clear that he was in favour of a single Dean. He suggested that if we choose to have three Deans we will be perceived as being in favour of creating three Faculties. Based on pedagogical, philosophical and practical reasons he was in favour of the existing Faculty. He considered the Faculty of Arts and Science to contain the core of what should be at a university and he wanted to protect that core. He said he was also committed to eliminating the Divisions because he considered them divisive. In their place, he envisioned the possible creation of "clusters", but only at the discretion of the new Dean. He voiced his concern that our present commitment to multidisciplinarity would be placed in jeopardy under the present three-dean, three-faculty

structure. He concluded by saying that if the present Arts and Science administrative structure is maintained we could be spelling the end of colleges, the end of interdisciplinary programmes, and the end of multidisciplinarity. He thought that the debate had been adequate and that the discussion should be made.

82-12-6

(Petrie/Ryan) to table the discussion until the January meeting to enable members of Council to get feedback and to refer to various constituencies with regard to additional evidence provided in the document to help in the understanding of the two reports before us.

Vote: defeated (10/16)

A vote was taken on the motion to approve recommendation 61 and it was carried (17/7/4)

Professor Maag asked to have her opposition to the motion recorded as well as the fact that her whole department is against it.

Dean Taddeo called for adjournment.

#### 7. Next Meeting

November 19, 1982, with the possibility of an additional meeting being called for Monday November 22.

#### Adjournment

82-12-7

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 P.M.  
(Taddeo/Megann)